

## **REMARKS**

Previous dependent claims 27 and 44 have now been written in independent form. More specifically, the subject matter of previous dependent claim 27, already considered by the Examiner in the final Office Action, has been incorporated into independent claim 24 from which claim 27 depended. The same is true of system claim 41 wherein the subject matter of now cancelled dependent claim 44, already considered by the Examiner, has been placed into claim 41. Claim 50 has been cancelled.

The Examiner rejects claims 24-30 and 41-50 under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Wiley in view of Campagna. Claims 31-40 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as unpatentable over Wiley in view of Campagna further in view of Snyders.

Claim 24 distinguishes in at least three different ways. First, claim 24 recites not storing the decrypted sensitive data in a readable decrypted form after the decrypting but before printing of the data. At page 7, middle of the page, the Examiner agrees that Wiley does not disclose this feature. The Examiner cites Campagna at paragraph 37 and the decrypt control signal. Paragraph 0037 teaches that any attempt to replay the encrypted print control signals or improperly decrypted print control signals will cause the printer to behave erratically and print an unusable image. But once properly decrypted and stored, the printer can print the sensitive data. But this is contrary to claim 24 which recites that the decrypted sensitive data is not stored in a readable decrypted form after the decrypting, but before printing of the data.

Next claim 24 distinguishes by reciting storing the decrypted sensitive data in a non-volatile memory such that the decrypted sensitive data are distributed in a

plurality of memory segments of the non-volatile memory. Although the Examiner contends that it is known prior art to store data in various segments of a memory, this statement must be read in conjunction with the previous portion of this claim element reciting that the decrypted sensitive data is not stored in a readable decrypted form after the decrypting but before the printing of the data. Thus although the Examiner is correct that it is known prior art to store decrypted data in a plurality of memory segments in Wiley, when the decrypted data is stored it is in a readable decrypted form before printing of the data. In Wiley the decrypted data is stored in a memory 1102 and is sent to the printer 1101 for printing. In Campagna the decryption circuit 44 decrypts the data and sends to the print driver where it may be printed. Thus both references are teaching directly away from the invention. Here again the Examiner's citation of paragraph 0037 in Campagna and the decrypt control signal simply teach that once properly decrypted, the data is ready for use. But that is not the case in claim 24. Even after decrypting the data cannot be printed without the independently stored relationship data.

Next, claim 24 distinguishes by reciting that a relationship of the memory segments in the non-volatile memory is stored in a volatile memory as relationship data independently of the stored decrypted sensitive data. The Examiner agrees at page 7 that Wiley does not teach any of this. Rather, the Examiner cites Campagna paragraph 0037 and the decrypt control signal. But paragraph 0037 and the decrypt control signal mention nothing about such an independent storage and a volatile memory of the relationship data which is independent of the stored decrypted sensitive data. Paragraph 0037 and the decrypt printer control signals simply describes that the decryption circuits decrypt the data; and when that decrypted data has been properly decrypted, it can be printed. But there is no hint or suggestion of

both a volatile memory and a non-volatile memory. At the bottom of page 7, the Examiner states, without citation of a specific portion of any reference, that it would have been obvious. But if Campagna and Wiley do not teach it, it cannot be obvious with no basis in either reference.

With respect to the language of previous dependent claim 27 reciting a volatile memory, which language is now incorporated into independent claim 24, the Examiner cites Wiley as disclosing a method wherein the relationship data is stored in a volatile memory – citing Figure 8 and memory 803 of Wiley as disclosing the relationship data stored in the volatile memory. However, memory 803 in Figure 8 of Wiley is storing the decrypted data, not relationship data, and there is no hint that it is storing relationship data in a volatile memory. The claim calls for two memories – a volatile memory and a non-volatile memory, yet Figure 8 of Wiley only shows one memory.

Campagna does not satisfy the missing details of Wiley which the Examiner has recognized are not present in Wiley. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Dependent claims 25-26 and 28-40 distinguish at least for the reasons noted with respect to claim 24 and also by reciting additional features not suggested. As to claims 31-40 which the Examiner rejects with Wiley and Campagna combined with the further reference Snyders, Snyders was only cited for providing both sensitive data and non-sensitive data but this reference was not cited for any of the above noted deficiencies pointed out with respect to claim 24 from which these dependent claims depend.

As to independent system claim 41, this claim distinguishes for the same reasons noted with respect to independent method claim 24. Note that claim 41 also now recites the volatile memory for the relationship data and wherein the


relationship is stored as relationship data in this volatile relationship data memory independently of the stored decrypted sensitive data in the non-volatile memory. This volatile memory language came from now cancelled dependent claim 44 now part of the independent claim 41, the claim from which it depended.

Dependent claims 42-43 and 45-49 distinguish at least for the reasons noted with respect to system claim 41 and also by reciting additional features not suggested.

Allowance of the application is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required, or to credit any overpayment to Account No.

Respectfully submitted,



(Reg.No.27,841)

Brett A. Valiquet  
Schiff Hardin LLP  
Patent Department  
Suite 6600 – 233 S. Wacker Drive  
Chicago, Illinois 60606  
Telephone: (312) 258-5786  
Attorneys for Applicants.  
**CUSTOMER NO. 26574**